



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/790,694

03/03/2004

Madan Mohan

34874-283

4326

64280

7590

07/15/2008

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.

ATTN: PATENT INTAKE CUSTOMER NO. 64280

ONE FINANCIAL CENTER

BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

VIDWAN, JASJIT S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2182

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/15/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/790,694

**Applicant(s)**

MOHAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

JASJIT S. VIDWAN

**Art Unit**

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 09/19/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-36 under Applicant Admitted Prior Art and further in view of Demarcken have been fully considered and/are found non-persuasive. Applicant argues that prior art of record fails to teach "...an availability query being created while the auxiliary computing platform is disconnected from the principle computing platform, and connecting to the principle computing platform after the creation of the availability query."
2. With respect to above argument, **Examiner disagrees**. Applicant basis his argument on the approach that the prior art fails to disclose an "offline" arrangement wherein the mobile device creates the query while offline. However, it should be noted that the Applicant's provided claims do not reflect this argument because as the Applicant would appreciate that being "offline" is considerably different than being simply "disconnected" from the principle computing platform. Furthermore, even if for the sake of an argument, we assume that disconnected is equivalent to being offline as claimed, Demarcken teaches creating a query and thereafter searching for results of the said query in the cache. Only after it is determined that the cache database does not contain the needed information, does the system connect to the principle computing platform. Therefore it is obvious that the query was created prior to the mobile device accessing the principal database.
3. In light of above response to arguments, it is the position of the Examiner that prior art reads on the claimed invention.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior art ("Background") [herein after **AAPA**] and further in view of Demarcken et al, U.S. Pub No: 2004/0249683 [herein after **Demarcken**].

3. **As per claims 1, 5 and 9, AAPA teaches a method of performing an availability check [see Paragraph 003 – "Availability of goods, known in the industry as "Available-to-Promise" or ATP or an availability check"] on a mobile device [Paragraph 004, "whereby a sales person performs an online check from her computer or personal digital assistant ("PDA")], comprising:**

Mobile device comprising a microprocessor and memory ["PDA" / "Laptop" – it is **inherent that both PDA and laptop will have a microprocessor and memory**]

Receiving an item number [Paragraph 003, "requested product"] and requested quantity of the item number [paragraph 003, "quantity requested"] on an auxiliary computing platform of the mobile device ["Paragraph 004" – **on the laptop or the PDA**], the auxiliary computing platform [laptop or PDA] disconnected from a principal computing platform [see Paragraph 002 and 004 – **AAPA teaches a system wherein the salesman using the 'auxiliary computer platform' could be in Cairo, Egypt while the central server could be located in Chicago, Illinois**];

Creating an availability query with parameters comprising the item number and the quantity [see paragraph 005, "...ATP checks are typically performed online from the sales person's computer to check the availability of product. For example, a sales person may place a laptop computer online at a customer's site and perform an ATP check by having the laptop query the remotely located back office], the availability query seeking the availability of the item number at the requested quantity from data records in a backend database without modifying the data records [see Paragraph 003, "An availability check is generally an online check to ensure that a company can provide the requested product at the requested time in the quantity requested by the customer." – the salesman is simply checking whether a particular item is available for sale or not at the requested quantity. Since there

**is no sale being performed during the availability check, no databases are updated of quantity of sale at anytime]**

Connecting to the principal computing platform [Paragraph 004 – using PDA to connect to a back office system to determine the availability of goods”] sending the availability query to the principle-computing platform [Paragraph 005, “...having laptop query the remotely located back office system”];

AAPA teaches the above limitations, however fails to teach a system wherein the availability query is created while the auxiliary computing platform is disconnected from the principle-computing platform. Demarcken of analogous art of providing availability queries teaches the above limitation of creating an availability query prior to the auxiliary computing platform being connected to the principle database [see Demarcken, Paragraph 0025 – Principle database being the “Travel Planning System (20)”]. Furthermore Demarcken teaches providing the user with the result of the query retrieved from either the cached database (16) or the Travel Planning System (20) [see Demarcken, Fig. 1, element 24].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to combine the two teachings in order to take advantage of reducing computational load to primary databases such as TPS [see Demarcken, Paragraph 0013]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have been motivated to combine the above two teachings.

5. **As per Claim 3, 17 and 21**, AAPA as modified by Demarcken above teaches a of performing an availability check on a mobile device, comprising:

(a) Synchronizing one or more data items in a backend database [see AAPA, Paragraph 0004, “Backend office” – or in case of Demarcken, see Fig. 1, element 16, “Cache database”] with one or more data items in a replica database located at the mobile device [see Demarcken, Paragraph 0026]

(b) Remaining limitations were addressed above in rejection of Claims 1, 5 & 9.

6. **As per claims 2, 6, 10, 14, 18 and 22**, AAPA as modified by Demarcken above teaches method further including displaying the query result to a user [see Demarcken, Fig. 1, element 24]
6. **As per claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23**, AAPA as modified by Demarcken above teaches method wherein the availability query is selected from at least one of a product availability check, a product allocation check, and a forecast check [see AAPA, paragraph 0004 – the back office system may be warehouse system that maintains an inventory of goods (product availability check) or may be a production planning system that maintains projections of future goods and their allocations (forecast check)]
7. **As per claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20 and 24**, AAPA as modified by Demarcken above teaches a method wherein the query result indicates at least one of a full, partial, or unavailable availability of the requested quantity [see Demarcken, paragraph 0009].
8. **As per Claims 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30**, AAPA as modified by Demarcken above teaches a system wherein the displayed result is other than a quantity number [see AAPA, paragraph 0003].
9. **As per Claims 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36**, AAPA as modified by Demarcken above teaches a method wherein the mobile device receives the item number and quantity from a user not in the physical presence of the item [see AAPA, paragraph 0002, sales person can be in Cairo, Egypt while the central server could be located in Chicago, Illinois].

#### ***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2182

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jasjit S. Vidwan whose telephone number is (571) 272-7936. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KIM HUYNH can be reached on (571) 272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JSV  
9/20/07

/Tariq Hafiz/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2182